

**STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT**

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**THE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY OF SENIOR LEADERS ON THE
OUTCOME OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG**

BY

**LIEUTENANT COLONEL MARK S. LANDRITH
United States Army**

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

**Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.**

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5



USAWC CLASS OF 1997

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

19970624 156

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

THE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY OF SENIOR LEADERS ON THE OUTCOME OF THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MARK S. LANDRITH
United States Army

Colonel Len Fullenkamp
Project Advisor

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release.
Distribution is limited.

| **DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8**

USAWC CLASS OF 1997

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Mark S. Landrith, LTC, AV

TITLE: The Effect of Personality of Senior Leaders on the Outcome of the Battle of Gettysburg

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 29 March 1997 PAGES: 36 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The intent of this paper is to explore the personal traits and leadership styles of the senior leaders of the Army of northern Virginia and the Army of the Potomac. Specifically, to show the interpersonal relationships between Generals Meade, Lee, Buford, and Stuart and their possible impact on the outcome of the battle of Gettysburg. Did the personalities of the army commander and his cavalry commander play an important role in their interpretation of commander's intent?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
THE SETTING	2
THE MEN	3
Major General George Gordon Meade	3
Major General Alfred Pleasonton	4
Brigadier General John Buford	4
General Robert E. Lee	5
Major General J. E. B. Stuart	6
THE QUESTIONS	9
The Army of Northern Virginia	9
The Army of the Potomac	13
THE CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX A (UNION CAVALRY ORDER OF BATTLE)	21
APPENDIX B (CONFEDERATE CAVALRY ORDER OF BATTLE)	24

PREFACE

I am not a military historian, however, the study of military history in general and specifically, the personalities and interpersonal relationships that affect that history has always held a great interest for me. Since my arrival at the U. S. Army War College, I have developed an interest in learning more about the men and the relationships of some of the key players in the battle of Gettysburg. My interest in this pivotal battle was heightened by a day long staff ride that I attended while a student at the college. After seeing and walking this field of honor, now several times, I have become keenly interested in the looking at the personalities and lessons to be learned from each great Army commander and the men that commanded their cavalry units. Why each of the key cavalry commanders made the decisions they did, what their relationship was with their army commander and how that relationship might have affected their interpretation of their senior commander's intent, as evidenced by the decisions they made were, in my mind, the questions that could be useful to me in my future dealings with both seniors and subordinates alike.

THE SETTING

In the heat of mid summer, 1863, two great Armies were about to engage in a struggle that would serve, in retrospect, to mark a major turning point for the bloodiest war in American history. In the quiet little cross-roads town of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, the Army of Northern Virginia, led by General Robert E. Lee would be drawn into battle with the Army of the Potomac, under the recent new command of General George G. Meade. While neither commander actually surveyed his maps and chose this site on which to do battle, both certainly understood the importance of winning the battle that was about to ensue.

Both Armies were nearly equal in strength, weaponry and training. The Army of Northern Virginia had a slight advantage in momentum and generalship while the Army of the Potomac was fighting on soil north of the Mason-Dixon line for the first time. What then was the major difference between these two great armies? Clearly, one commander had the luxury of nearly perfect knowledge of the enemy forces movements and dispositions while the other was being drawn into a battle of survival with virtually no knowledge of the enemy situation. How did this happen, and what were the factors at work that caused this situation at such a critical time?

THE MEN

Major General George Gordon Meade

HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY, WASHINGTON,D.C., JUNE 27,1863

Major General G. G. Meade,
Army of the Potomac.

General:

You will receive with this the order of the President placing you in command of the Army of the Potomac. Considering the circumstances, no one ever received a more important command; and I cannot doubt that you will justify the confidence which the Government has reposed in you.

You will not be hampered by any minute instructions from these headquarters. Your army is free to act as you may deem proper under the circumstances as they arise. You will, however, keep in view the important fact that the Army of the Potomac is the covering army of Washington, as well as the army of operation against the invading rebels.

..... You are authorized to remove from command and send from your army any officer or other person you may deem proper; and appoint to command as you may deem expedient.

In fine, General, you are intrusted with all the power and authority which the President, the Secretary of War, or the General-in-chief can confer on you, and you may rely on our full support.

Very Respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
H. W. Halleck,
General-in-Chief¹

So it was. Just four days before one of history's most written about battles, General George G. Meade assumed command of the Army of the Potomac. The 47 year old general now led more men than at any point in his career. Having been born in Spain and educated at West Point (class of '35), General Meade had commanded brigades in the battles of Seven Days, Mechanicsville, Gaines' Mill, Glendale, and Second Bull Run. He

commanded 3rd Division/III Corps at Antietam and Fredericksburg and had recently commanded V Corps at the battle of Chancellorsville.

Major General Alfred Pleasonton

General Alfred Pleasonton was also a West Point graduate who, at the age of 38, commanded the cavalry forces of the Army of the Potomac. Like Meade, Pleasonton had risen through the ranks of command from brigade to corps. His wartime experience was in cavalry organizations at South Mountain, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and Brandy Station.

Brigadier General John Buford

The commander of Pleasonton's First Division, and one of the key players in the battle of Gettysburg, was the mild mannered, pipe smoking, Brigadier General John Buford of Kentucky. General Buford was also an 1848 graduate of the military academy at West Point. He had served frontier duty during the Utah expedition and had seen wartime service during action at Thoroughfare Gap, Antietam, and Stoneman's raid on Richmond. A soldiers General, Buford was well respected by not only his cavalry troopers but by the foot infantry soldiers that served with him.

In contrast to well tailored commanders...., given to strutting and preening, Buford's habitual field garb consisted of a Kentucky hunting shirt-a well worn, dark blue blouse "ornamented with holes," which he sometimes wore under, sometimes in place of, his general officer's tunic.... "from one pocket thereof peeps a pipe, while the other is fat with a tobacco pouch." The remainder of his attire included "ancient" corduroy pants, "tucked into a pair of ordinary cowhide boots," and a small black felt hat, the type anyone might wear.
"He didn't put on so much style as most officers" commented one of his troopers.²

General Buford is credited with making the “read” at the battle of Gettysburg that correctly identified the Confederate point of attack, realizing the significance of the terrain to the west and south of Gettysburg, and informing his higher commanders, Reynolds and Meade of the importance of the area and the need to speed their approach to the town. On the evening of the 30th of June, the night before the battle of Gettysburg was to begin, Colonel Thomas Devin tried to reassure Buford that his brigade could handle anything the Confederate soldiers could throw at him. Buford warned Devin,

“No you won’t. They will attack you in the morning and they will come booming-skirmishers three deep. You will have to fight like the devil to hold your own until supports arrive. The enemy must know the importance of this position and will strain every nerve to secure it, and if we are able to hold it, we will do well.”³

Later that same evening, Buford drafted a dispatch to be sent to his commanding General. It read, in part,

Gettysburg, June 30, 1863-10:30 P. M.

I am satisfied that A. P. Hill’s corps is massed just back of Cashtown, about nine miles from this place. Pender’s division of this corps (Hill’s) came up today, of which I advised you, saying “the enemy in my front has increased”. The enemy pickets are within four miles of this place, at the Cashtown road. Near Heildersburg, today, one of my parties captured a courier of Lee’s; nothing was found on him. He says Ewell’s corps is crossing the mountains from Carlisle, Roach’s division being at Petersburg in advance. Longstreet, from all I can learn, is still behind Hill.⁴

General Robert E. Lee

For the Army of Northern Virginia, their commander was the great General Robert E. Lee. This 56 year old native Virginian had also graduated from West Point, where he is rumored to be the only person in the history of the school to have gone all four years and not received a single demerit. A well recognized field general, Lee turned down the offer

of commanding Union forces during the war, resigned in April of 1861 and later that year assumed command of the Army of Northern Virginia.

Major General J. E. B. Stuart

The cavalry forces of the Army of Northern Virginia were commanded by the dashing and flamboyant General James Ewell Brown “J.E.B.” Stuart of Virginia. General Stuart was only 30 years old at the time of Gettysburg and had been out of West Point for just 9 years. Most notable of General Stuart’s previous assignments was his time as an aide to General Robert E. Lee. Lee was a Lieutenant Colonel at the time, but the “forward looking”⁵ young Lieutenant Stuart found a way to place himself next to this great man at a critical time during the attack to seize John Brown at Harper’s Ferry. Stuart now had the opportunity to serve closely with the officer that had served as the commandant of West Point during his time as a cadet there.

Some insight into J.E.B. Stuart, the man, can be gained from the telling of a story about the days just after the Confederate victory at Chancellorsville.

The Major General commanding (Stuart) put on his West Point manner, harassing plain combat colonels, southern gentlemen who prefer informal war. You see elegant young men greasing their own leather, and shining their metal with wood ashes, and grooming their horses. J.E.B. Stuart hopes the Commanding General will come over and review his brigades. Letters pass, but Lee is very busy, and on 5 June, J.E.B. Stuart holds his own review, in the open fields between Brandy Station and Culpepper. It is a brilliant occasion, with ladies and gentlemen from all over the region banked behind the reviewing stand. Eight thousand cavalry men pass in review, in column of squadrons, first at a walk, then at a thundering gallop, J.E.B. Stuart taking the march past. Opposite the reviewing stand, the massed horse artillery battalion fires salutes, a noble, war-like noise, with highly decorative white smoke clouds curling up the blue heaven. Stuart indulged to the full his taste for pomp and panoply...⁶

Three days later Lee would come to review Stuart's troopers. After telling Stuart to forego the cannons and the galloping horses, in order to save the horses and the powder, Lee took the review of his cavalry troopers. Upon returning to his headquarters later that day, Lee, in a letter written to his wife, comments, "it was a splendid sight. The men and horses look well. ... Stuart was in all his glory".⁷

General Stuart and his cavalry were the eyes and ears for General Lee and his Confederate forces. The Pennsylvania offensive was specifically intended to make a statement that the war would no longer be confined to the soil of the southern states. It was important for the Confederate cause that this first battle on Union soil be a victory. The plan was not merely to fight on northern ground, it was to fight and win on northern ground. For this, General Lee would need to pick the time and the place to give battle that would afford his forces the best opportunity for victory. Why then were J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry forces, and more importantly, why was J.E.B. Stuart not at the right hand of his commander providing the critical intelligence on the enemy's disposition and movements at such a crucial time? The importance of this untimely absence was certainly not lost on General Lee.

...Stuart reached Army headquarters on the Chambersburg Pike a mile west of Gettysburg. Dismounting and striding to General Lee's tent, he saluted his commander and reported the arrival of his raiding force - over 60 hours late. Lee criticized his subordinates so infrequently that when he did he needed few words to drive home his feelings. This trait was evident during his belated rendezvous with Stuart late on 2 July. At first, the army commander regarded his cavalry leader with silence that was itself a rebuke. Finally, he asked a quiet question: "General Stuart, where have you been?"

Flustered, Stuart attempted an explanation too long, too involved and too vague for his superior's patience. Lee cut him short with a voice that smoldered: "I have not heard a word from you for days, and you the eyes and ears of my army!"

Embarrassed staff officer averted their eyes as Stuart struggled to reply. The cavalry leader looked like a man who had just taken a blow in the face.⁸

THE QUESTIONS

As I began to look at the possible reasons for the apparent differences in the ways the two Cavalry commanders fought the battle of Gettysburg, two striking differences emerged. The first being the way in which they dealt with their respective senior commanders and their orders, and the second being the individual command style or personality of the cavalry commanders in question.

A comparison of the operations orders written by the headquarters of Meade's Army of the Potomac and those of General Lee's Army of Northern Virginia, shows two distinctly different styles in orders writing. Looking closely at the orders prepared by the two headquarters immediately prior to the battle of Gettysburg, the orders that ultimately set the conditions for the start of the battle, we can gain some insight into the factors that placed their two great cavalry commanders in the positions that they were in when history decided to lower it's microscope onto their careers. One commander emerged as the hero of the battle for keeping his higher commander apprised of the enemy situation nearly perfectly; the other the goat for being out of position and rendering his Army nearly deaf and blind.

The Army of Northern Virginia

Let's look first at the order issued by General Robert E. Lee. On 22 June, 1863, Lee informed Ewell that Stuart will cross the Potomac with three brigades and report to him in Pennsylvania, to cover his right.⁹ In the late afternoon of June 23, 1863, General Lee issued the following instructions to his cavalry commander General JEB Stuart,

June 23, 1863, 5 P.M.

Major-General J. E. B. Stuart, Commanding Cavalry.

General:

Your notes of 9 and 10:30 today have just been received. As regards the purchase of tobacco for your men, supposing the Confederate money will not be taken, I am willing for commissaries or quartermasters to purchase this tobacco, and let the men get it from them, but I can have nothing seized by the men. If General Hookers Army remains inactive you can leave two brigades to watch him, and withdraw the three others, but should he not appear to be moving northward, I think you had better withdraw this side of the mountains tomorrow night, cross at Shepherdstown next day, and move over to Fredericktown. You will, however, be able to judge whether you can pass around their army without hindrance, doing them all the damage you can, and cross the river east of the mountains. In either case, after crossing the river, you must move on and feel the right of Ewell's troops, collecting information, provisions, etc. Give instructions to the commander of the brigades left behind to watch the flank and rear of the army, and, in the event of the enemy leaving their front, to retire from the mountains west of the Shenandoah, leaving sufficient pickets to guard the passes, and to bring in everything clean along the valley, closing upon the rear of the Army. As regards the movements of the two brigades of the enemy moving towards Warrenton, the commander of the brigades to be left in the mountains must do what he can to counteract them, but I think the sooner you cross into Maryland after tomorrow the better. The movements of Ewell's Corps are, as stated in my former letter. Hill's First Division will reach the Potomac today and Longstreet will follow tomorrow. Be watchful and circumspect in your movements.

I am very respectfully and truly yours,
R. E. Lee, General¹⁰

This order reached Stuart's headquarters late on the evening of the 23rd during what was described as a driving rain storm. The order was presented to Stuart, who was sleeping in the rain along with his men, by his adjutant. It is not clear how much if any mission analysis took place in the dark and rain of this fateful night, but it is clear that Stuart developed the plan and issued the orders for his subordinate troops within minutes of his receipt of orders from Lee. If we look now at the order issued by Lee, and attempt to

apply some modern day principles to the orders process, we can get a sense of higher commander's intent.

In recent years our Army has entertained a great deal of discussion about the importance of a commander's vision of an operation and how that vision is communicated through commander's intent. Field Manual 100-5, Operations, defines commander's intent as,

a concise expression of the purpose of an operation, a description of the desired end state, and the way in which the posture of that goal facilitates transition to future operations.¹¹

Commander's intent is further described as,

The commander's intent describes the desired end state. It is a concise expression of the purpose of the operation and must be understood two echelons below the issuing commander. It must clearly state the purpose of the mission. It is the single unifying focus for all subordinate elements. It is not a summary of the concept of the operation. Its purpose is to focus subordinates on the desired end state. Its utility is to focus subordinates on what has to be accomplished in order to achieve success, even when the plan and concept of operation no longer apply, and to discipline their efforts toward that end.¹²

General Lee issues orders to split the cavalry forces into two distinct groups. One will stay with the main body of the Army and perform the typical cavalry role of the day, that being flank and rear security for the Army. Those orders are clear and Stuart has no difficulty with that part of the order. The second group of troopers is given a mission that is less well defined and whose endstate is nearly indiscernible. It is the orders for these troopers that will open Stuart's actions to debate.

Lee tells his cavalry commander that if it is possible, he should pass around Hookers Army, doing the maximum damage possible, and cross the river east of the mountains. If Stuart is unable to get around Hooker, or if Hookers troops do not appear to be

withdrawing to the north, Stuart is to withdraw to the west of the mountains. The implication is that Lee wants his cavalry to be in close proximity to Ewell's forces. He further states this in telling Stuart that in either case, he should move on and feel the right of Ewell's troops, and collect information and provisions. The closest thing to commander's intent in this order may well be the last sentence. Lee specifically orders Stuart to, "be watchful and circumspect in your movements".

Armed with these orders, Stuart sets his plan into motion by assembling three brigades of cavalry at Salem with himself on the 24th of June. In the early morning hours of the 25th, Stuart begins his fateful march around the Union Army by moving eastward. At dawn his troopers had arrived in the vicinity of Haymarket where he had planned to turn north and continue his march. He was met by roads crowded with Union soldiers of Hancock's Corps. He now was faced with one of two choices, he could either return over the ground just traveled or move even further east to get around the flank of Hancock's forces before making his move north. This is where I believe Stuart lost sight of his higher commanders intent. Remember that Lee had directed Stuart to be watchful and circumspect in the movement of this force. Additionally, he was to move on and feel the right of Ewell's Corps. He was now over 45 miles from the nearest element of Ewell's Corps. Every step he takes further to the east is another step away from Ewell.

The dictionary defines circumspect as cautious, prudent, careful, guarded and wary. These, however, are not adjectives often used in describing Major General J.E.B. Stuart. Here, I believe, the ego and flamboyant nature of Stuart caused him to make a fateful

decision. Riding a recent high of successes, he turned his force even further east, not to be reunited with his Army until after the second days fight at Gettysburg.

Clearly Lee's orders could have been more succinct with regard to what exactly he expected this three brigade force to accomplish and exactly where he expected them to do it. This was not the first time that a subordinate had a problem with Lee's orders. Little more than a month before, General D. H. Hill had reason to question the ambiguity of orders he received from Lee.

May 29th, 1863

To His Excellency President Davis

I gave Genl Hill discretionary orders from Richmond to apportion his force to the strength of enemy and send what could be spared. He declined to act and requested positive orders. I gave such orders as I could at this distance. Now he objects. I cannot operate in this manner. I request you to cause such orders to be given him as your judgment dictates. Pickett has no brigade in place of Jenkin's so Genl Longstreet reports. Genl Hill has retained one Regt. From Pettigrew and one from Daniels.

R. E. Lee¹³

The Army of the Potomac

By contrast, the new commander of the Army of the Potomac, had nearly confined his cavalry commander to operating out of the Army headquarters with him. Recently promoted, Major General Alfred Pleasonton was not allowed to accompany his cavalry troopers in the field. He had been ordered by Meade to pitch his tent right next to that of the Army commander. Virtually the only contact that Pleasonton had with his cavalry forces was through members of his staff and written orders.¹⁴ With the new Army commander in place, it was clear that Pleasonton would not directly lead his cavalry

corps into battle. He would instead, assign the divisions of his corps missions to be accomplished under the overall command of the infantry corps with which they were associated.

Within hours of having assumed command of the Army of the Potomac, General George G. Meade issued the following detailed orders to his troops.

Headquarters Army of the Potomac,
Frederick, MD., June 28, 1863.

Orders:

The Army will march to-morrow (SIC) as follows:

4 A. M. The 1st Corps, Major General Reynolds, by Lewistown and Mechanicstown to Emmettsburg, keeping the left of the road from Frederick to Lewistown, between J. P. Cramer's and where the road branches to Utica and Cregerstown, to enable the 11th Corps to march parallel to it. ... (Each additional Corps is given the same type of explicit orders for their route of march as are the reserve artillery, engineers, and headquarters elements)

The cavalry will guard the right and left flanks and the rear, and give the Commanding General information of the movement and of the enemy in front. Strong exertions are required and must be made to prevent straggling.

By command of Major General Meade,

S. Williams,
Asst. Adj't. Gen'l¹⁵

On the evening of the 29th of June, Brigadier General John Buford was given the mission of being the advance element of the Army. He received orders from Pleasonton to send two of his brigades and a horse battery forward to Emmetsburg, staying forward of Major General John Reynolds' 1st Corps, continue on to Gettysburg and to locate Lee's Army and discern its intentions. His third brigade was to march further east protecting his right and Reynolds left.¹⁶

While the orders that were issued by Lee to Stuart were full of if's and were open to wide interpretation, the orders given to Buford were anything but. Buford's orders were

clear and concise. He knew, from them, that it was Meade's intent to find the enemy and fight him on terms and terrain favorable to the Army of the Potomac. Additionally, Buford was a man known for his steady, even manner and expert intelligence gathering skills. He was neither flamboyant, nor a risk taker.

Another plus for the Army of the Potomac was that Reynolds and Buford knew and trusted each other well. Major Joseph G. Rosengarten writes of their relationship,

Reynolds knew Buford thoroughly, and knowing him and the value of cavalry under such a leader, sent them through the mountain passes beyond Gettysburg to find and feel the enemy. The old rule would have been to keep them back near the infantry, but Reynolds sent Buford on, and Buford went on, knowing that whenever Reynolds sent him, he was sure to be supported, followed, and secure ... Buford and Reynolds were soldiers of the same order, and in each found in the other just the qualities that were most needed to perfect and complete the task entrusted to them. ... It was (Buford's) foresight and energy, his pluck and self-reliance, in thrusting forward his forces and pushing the enemy, and thus inviting, almost compelling their return, that brought on the engagement of the first of July.

Buford counted on Reynolds support, and he had it fully, faithfully, and energetically When (Reynolds) got Buford's demand for infantry support on the morning of the first, it was just what Reynolds had expected, and with characteristic energy, he went forward, saw Buford, accepted at once the responsibility, and returning to find the leading division of the First Corps, took it in hand, brought it to the front, put it in position, renewed his orders for the rest of the Corps, and assigned the positions for the other divisions.¹⁷

Had Reynolds and Buford not known each other as well, or, worse yet, had they not trusted each other as completely, the final outcome of the battle of Gettysburg could have been quite different, or more likely, could have not happened at all. If Reynolds had kept Buford closer to protect his flanks, the cavalry troopers would not have been in position to fight the delaying action west and north of the town that ultimately allowed the Army of the Potomac to fight defensively from the best available terrain in the area. If Reynolds had not believed the first reports of Buford on the evening of the 30th and the

early morning hours of the 1st, Buford would have suffered even greater casualties, been pushed back through the town, and could have ultimately been turned to a rout before Reynolds Corps could have made a difference. Clearly, this special relationship between these two commanders had a positive impact on the conduct of this battle.

One historian observes of Buford's reports on the evening of the 30th of June, that,

"this was cavalry scouting and reporting at their best, a model of precision and accuracy, with fact carefully separated from rumor".¹⁸

The only hint of real concern that I can find from Buford comes in a post script he adds to a note sent to Pleasonton on the afternoon of the 1st of July. In it he continues to report on the battle, telling Pleasonton,

July 1, 1863 - 3:20 P.M.

I am satisfied that Longstreet and Hill have made a junction. A tremendous battle has been raging since 9 ½ A.M., with varying success. At the present moment the battle is raging on the height from north and west. General Reynolds was killed early this morning. In my opinion there seems to be no directing person.

John Buford,
Brigadier General of Volunteers.

We need help now.

Buford¹⁹

Exactly what we would expect from the man that had spent a lifetime perfecting his skills and, unlike many, if not most cavalry officer of the day, distancing himself from the traps of glory, fame, and showmanship. Major General James H. Wilson sums up Buford quite well with the description,

He was considered as the soldier par excellence No man could be more popular or sincerely beloved by his fellow officers, nor could any officer be more thoroughly respected and admired by his men than he was. His company had no superior in the service

.... He was a splendid cavalry officer, and one of the most successful in the service; he was modest, yet brave; unostentatious, but prompt and persevering;

ever ready to go where duty called him, and never shrinking from action however fraught with peril.²⁰

THE CONCLUSION

In attempting to offer some conclusions to this project, there are two major cautions that should be observed. First, we look now on the actions of these brave men with the 100% wisdom afforded by near perfect hindsight. As we sit in our comfortable classrooms and dissect the decisions that were made in the heat of battle over 130 years ago, it is well to remember that these men, on both sides of the conflict, were among the very best and brightest of their time. They were working with limited communications equipment and virtually none of the intelligence gathering systems that we have grown used to and most importantly, we now know the outcome of the battle and the war.

The second caution is this. Any attempt to apply current military thinking and processes to an historic battle, is likely to make the entire study of history a frustrating and fruitless endeavor. To say that Lee did not clearly articulate his commander's intent to Stuart in a five paragraph order has about as much importance as arguing that he misused his Apache helicopters in the cavalry fight. He had neither at the time.

What is important is to attempt to learn some of the strengths and weaknesses that existed in the way these great men thought about and fought a battle, and apply these lessons to our modern war fighting.

As I researched the battle of Gettysburg, searching for lessons that would be of use to tomorrow's senior leaders, the most striking lesson is certainly not a new one. It is, that

the importance of clearly communicating the senior commander's desired outcome of an operation with subordinate commanders can not be over emphasized. Whether this communication is written or verbal does not seem to matter nearly as much as whether it is clear, unambiguous, and perfectly understood by all of the parties involved. Failing to communicate clearly allows for interpretation of what is important and fails to focus the subordinate commander on what the key elements of his mission will be. Lee's orders to Stuart were open to interpretation and in some cases guess work, while those issued to Buford were almost excruciatingly detailed and specific. Even today, authors on the subject believe that Stuart's utilization of his cavalry was well within the direction he was given in his orders, but being within the letter of an order completely ignores what the spirit, or intent, of an order is. On the other side of the coin, Meade, Pleasonton, Reynolds, and Buford operated on orders that were clear in their definition of senior commanders intent for the operation. An old proverb says that, "if you don't know where your going any road can take you there". When lives are on the line, there can be no excuse for "wandering about" the battlefield. Each individual and unit must be clearly focused on their part of the overall scheme of battle.

A second major rule that comes through clearly is the need to maintain continual communications with higher headquarters and constantly report. Buford's reports both before and during the battle were a model of near perfection. By constantly updating and keeping his commander's apprised of his situation, he provided his commanders with the information necessary to make key decisions. While Stuart and his troopers were inflicting some damage to Union forces by their presence in the Union rear, his failure to

communicate his location or intentions to his commander for over a week left Lee with no feel for the enemy and was, in my mind, a self-serving glory ride for General Stuart at a critical time. That leads us to the last important aspect of this study. That being how the personalities of the players affect the outcome of battle.

While all of the players in this great battle had some sense of self-worth, there is one whose ego stands head and shoulders above all the others. Major General J. E. B. Stuart is that man. Whether it was his youth or something worse, General Stuart's service for self ultimately got in the way of sound decision making. When compared to the self-less service of men like Lee, Reynolds, and particularly Buford, General Stuarts demise was almost predictable. It is not enough to merely caution future leaders of our Army about the evils of self promotion and arrogance in battle, we must diligently look for this trait in our subordinates. Once identified, we must work to change this flawed thought process, but more importantly, we must fundamentally change the way we deal with these officers in the orders we write and in the level of flexibility we afford them in their decision making process. Reynolds and Buford provide us with perfect examples of exceptionally competent officers, selfless servants, who, when given wide discretion in the execution of their assigned tasks, were more concerned with mission accomplishment than with personal acknowledgment.

Recent U. S. Army emphasis on clearly defined commander's intent, orders back-briefs, and rehearsals of operations are all attempts to ensure that all the players understand the desired endstate of an operation. Their importance can not be overlooked.

Regardless of the amount of time available, these simple procedures will save lives and go far toward ensuring the success of an operation.

APPENDIX A (UNION CAVALRY ORDER OF BATTLE)

CAVALRY CORPS

Major General Alfred Pleasonton

First Division

Brigadier General John Buford

First Brigade

Colonel William Gamble

8th Illinois

Major John L. Beveridge

12th Illinois (6 cos.)

Colonel George H. Chapman

3rd Indiana (6 cos.)

Colonel George H. Chapman

8th New York

Lieutenant Colonel William L. Markell

Second Brigade

Colonel Thomas C. Devin

6th New York

Major William E. Beadsley

9th New York

Colonel William Sackett

17th Pennsylvania

Colonel Josiah H. Kellogg

3rd West Virginia (2 cos.)

Captain Seymour B. Conger

Reserve Brigade

Brigadier General Wesley Merritt

6th Pennsylvania

Major James H. Heseltine

1st United States

Captain Richard S. C. Lord

2nd United States

Captain Theophilus F. Rodenbough

5th United States	Captain Julius W. Mason
6th United States	Major Samuel H. Starr
	---Lieutenant Louis H. Carpenter
	---Lieutenant Nicholas Nolan
	---Captain Ira W. Claflin
Second Division	Brigadier General David McM. Gregg
First Brigade	Colonel John B. McIntosh
1st Maryland (11 cos.)	Lieutenant Colonel James L. Deems
Purnell (Maryland) Legion Co. (A)	Captain Robert E. Duvall
1st Massachusetts	Lieutenant Colonel Greely S. Curtis
1st New Jersey	Major Myron H. Beaumont
1st Pennsylvania	Colonel John P. Taylor
3rd Pennsylvania	Lieutenant Colonel Edward S. Jones
3rd Pennsylvania Artillery Battery	Captain William D. Rank
Third Brigade	Colonel J. Irvin Gregg
1st Maine (10 cos.)	Lieutenant Colonel Charles H. Smith
10th New York	Major M. Henry Avery
4th Pennsylvania	Lieutenant Colonel William E. Doster
16th Pennsylvania	Lieutenant Colonel John K. Robison

Third Division	Brigadier General Judson Kilpatrick --- Colonel Nathaniel P. Richmond
First Brigade	Brigadier General Elon J. Farnsworth
5th New York	Major John Hammond
18th Pennsylvania	Lieutenant Colonel William P. Brinton
1st Vermont	Lieutenant Colonel Addison Preston
1st West Virginia (10 cos.)	Colonel Nathaniel P. Richmond --- Major Charles E. Capehart
Second Brigade	Brigadier General George A. Custer
1st Michigan	Colonel Charles H. Town
5th Michigan	Colonel Russell A. Alger
6th Michigan	Colonel George Gray
7th Michigan (10 cos.)	Colonel William D. Mann

APPENDIX B (CONFEDERATE CAVALRY ORDER OF BATTLE)

Stuart's Division	Major General James E. B. Stuart
Hampton's Brigade	Brigadier General Wade Hampton --- Colonel Laurence S. Baker
1st North Carolina	Colonel Laurence S. Baker
1st South Carolina	Colonel John L. Black
2nd South Carolina	Colonel Matthew C. Butler
Cobb's (Georgia) Legion	Colonel Pierce B. L. Young
Jeff Davis (Mississippi) Legion	Colonel Joseph F. Waring
Phillips' (Georgia) Legion	Lieutenant Colonel Jefferson Phillips
Fitz Lee's Brigade	Brigadier General W. Fitzhugh Lee
1st Maryland Battalion	Major Harry Gilmore --- Major Ridgely Brown
1st Virginia	Colonel James H. Drake
2nd Virginia	Colonel Thomas T. Munford
3rd Virginia	Colonel Thomas H. Owen
4th Virginia	Colonel William Carter Wickham
Robertson's Brigade	Brigadier General Beverly Robertson

4th North Carolina	Colonel Dennis D. Ferebee
5th North Carolina	Colonel Peter G. Evans
Jenkins' Brigade	Brigadier General Albert G. Jenkins
	--- Colonel Milton J. Ferguson
14th Virginia	Major Benjamin F. Eakle
16th Virginia	Colonel Milton J. Ferguson
17th Virginia	Colonel William H. French
34th Virginia Battalion	Lieutenant Colonel Vincent Witcher
36th Virginia Battalion	Captain Cornelius T. Smith
Jackson's (Virginia) Battery	Captain Thomas E. Jackson
Jones's Brigade	Brigadier General William E. Jones
6th Virginia	Major Cabel E. Flourney
7th Virginia	Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Marshall
11th Virginia	Colonel Lunsford L. Lomax
W. H. F. Lee's Brigade	Colonel John R. Chambliss, Jr.
2nd North Carolina	Colonel Solomon Williams
9th Virginia	Colonel Richard L. T. Beale
10th Virginia	Colonel J. Lucius Davis
13th Virginia	Captain Benjamin F. Winfield

Stuart Horse Artillery	Major Robert F. Beckham
Breathed's (Virginia) Battery	Captain James Breathed
Chew's (Virginia) Battery	Captain R. Preston Chew
Griffin's (Maryland) Battery	Captain William H. Griffin
Hart's (South Carolina) Battery	Captain James F. Hart
McGregor's (Virginia) Battery	Captain William M. McGregor
Moorman's (Virginia) Battery	Captain Marcellus M. Moorman
Imboden's Command	Brigadier General John D. Imboden
18th Virginia	Colonel George W. Imboden
62nd Virginia Infantry, Mounted	Colonel George H. Smith
Virginia Partisan Rangers	Captain John H. McNeill
Virginia (Staunton) Battery	Captain John H. McClanahan

¹ George Meade, The Life and Letters of George Gordon Meade (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), 3-4.

² Edward G. Longacre, General John Buford (Conshohocken, PA: Combined Books, 1995), 87-88.

³ Ibid., 188.

⁴ Meade, 383.

⁵ John W. Thomason, Jr., JEB Stuart (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 49.

⁶ Ibid., 397.

⁷ Ibid., 398.

⁸ Edward G. Longacre, The Cavalry at Gettysburg (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 202.

⁹ Thomason, 422.

¹⁰ Ibid., 422-423.

¹¹ Department of the Army, Operations, Field Manual 100-5 (Washington: U. S. Department of the Army, 1993) Glossary-2.

¹² Ibid., 6-6.

¹³ Douglas Southall Freeman, Lee's Dispatches (New York, NY.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1957), 99-100.

¹⁴ Longacre, The Cavalry at Gettysburg 168.

¹⁵ Meade, 9-10.

¹⁶ Longacre, General John Buford, 179.

¹⁷ Major Joseph G. Rosengarten, General Reynold's Last Battle (Dayton, OH: Morningside House, Inc., 1988), 62-3.

¹⁸ Longacre, General John Buford, 187.

¹⁹ Meade, 389.

²⁰ James H. Wilson, Brevet Major General, "Major General John Buford," Journal of the United States Cavalry Association, VIII, no.30 (September 1895): 174-5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Bates, Samuel Penniman. The Battle of Gettysburg. Philadelphia, PA: T. H. Davis & Co., 1875; reprint, Gaithersburg, MD: Ron R. Van Sickle Military Books, 1987.

Bellah, James Warner. Soldier's Battle Gettysburg. New York, NY: David McKay Co.. Inc., 1962.

Cleaves, Newell. Meade of Gettysburg. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960.

Coddington, Edwin B. The Gettysburg Campaign: a Study in Command. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1968; reprint, New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1984.

Freeman, Douglas Southall, ed., Lee's Dispatches. New York, NY.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1957.

Longacre, Edward G. The Cavalry at Gettysburg. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.

_____. General John Buford. Conshohocken, PA: Combined Books, 1995.

Marshal, Francis. The Battle of Gettysburg: The Crest-wave of the American Civil War. New York, NY: The Neale Publishing Company, 1914.

Meade, George. The Life and Letters of George Gordon Meade. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Montgomery, James Stuart. The Shaping of a Battle: Gettysburg. Philadelphia, PA: Chilton Company, 1959.

Rhodes, Charles Dudley. History of the Cavalry in the Army of the Potomac. Kansas City, MO: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Company, 1900.

Rosengarten, Joseph G. Major. General Reynold's Last Battle. Dayton, OH: Morningside House, Inc., 1988.

Starr, Stephen Z. The Union Cavalry in the Civil War. 3 Volumes. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.

Thomason, John W. Jr. JEB Stuart. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

Young, Jesse Bowman. The Battle of Gettysburg. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1913.

ARTICLES:

Wilson, James H. Brevet Major General. "Major General John Buford." Journal of the United States Cavalry Association VIII, no.30 (September 1895): 174-5.

MILITARY PUBLICATIONS:

U. S. Department of the Army. Operations, Field Manual 100-5. Washington: U. S. Department of the Army, 1993.